CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator:		Team:	CCRB Case #:	Ø	Force	$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	Discourt.		U.S.
Rebecca Ho		Squad #3	201502958	Ø	Abuse		O.L.	$\overline{\checkmark}$	Injury
Incident Date(s)		Location of Incident:		F	Precinct:	18	Mo. SOL	Е	O SOL
Saturday, 04/18/2015 8:10 PM		Utica Avenue between and Church Avenue	Snyder Avenue		67	10	/18/2016	10/	/18/2016
Date/Time CV Reported		CV Reported At:	How CV Reported:		Date/Time	Rece	eived at CCI	RB	
Sun, 04/19/2015 8:02 AM		CCRB	On-line website		Sun, 04/19	/2015	8:02 AM		
Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Addre	ss						
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command						
1. POM Arturo Gomez	14128	954876	PBBS						
2. POM Miguel Vanbrakle	28743	955616	PBBS						
3. LT Timothy Edwards	00000	922299	067 PCT						
Officer(s)	Allegation	on			Inve	stiga	tor Recon	nmer	ndation
A.POM Miguel Vanbrakle	Discourte	esy: PO Miguel Vanbrak	tle spoke rudely to	87(2))					
B.POM Arturo Gomez	Force: Po	O Arturo Gomez used ph	nysical force against	§ 87((b)	2)				
C.POM Miguel Vanbrakle	Force: P(§ 87(2)(b)	O Miguel Vanbrakle use	d physical force aga	inst					
D.POM Arturo Gomez	Abuse: P property.	O Arturo Gomez damag	red § 87(2)(b) S						
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)									

Case Summary On April 19, 2015, at approximately 8:10 p.m., was driving his Ford Mustang convertible Utica Avenue in Brooklyn when he was pulled over by PO Arturo Gomez and PO Miguel Van Brakle between Snyder Avenue and Church Street. PO Gomez stood at the driver's side door and asked for §87(2)(b) for his identification. § 87(2)(b) asked PO Gomez what he had been pulled over for; in response PO Croker asked \$87(2)(b) for his identification and informed him if he did not produce identification he would be removed from his car. responded by asking PO Gomez to request a supervisor to the scene. PO Van Brakle said to § 87(2)(b) "Who the fuck do you think you are requesting a fucking supervisor?" (Allegation A). Then, PO Gomez and PO Van Brakle entered \$87(2)(6) s vehicle to pull him out and place him in handcuffs. §87(2)(b) alleged he was thrown against the hood of the police car which caused him to sustain scratches to his shins (Allegations B and C) (Board Review 01). Lt. Timothy Edwards and other officers had responded to the scene. Lt. Edwards spoke with and asked him to provide his identification. When §87(2)(b) did not provide his identification, Lt. Edwards instructed officers to bring him back to the 67th Precinct stationhouse. was brought over to the side of the police vehicle where his head was pushed into the police car by PO Van Brakle as another officer grabbed his legs and flung them into the car. PO Van Brakle said to § 87(2)(b) "Get the fuck in the car. Who the fuck do you think you are?" (Allegation A continued). PO Gomez drove §87(2)(b) s Mustang back to the 67th Precinct stationhouse. After two hours in the stationhouse holding cell, \$87(2)(6) was released with four summonses – two for window tints, one for disorderly conduct, and another for a loud exhaust (Board Review 02). observed a large scratch on his vehicle that was not there prior to PO Gomez driving it (Allegation D). Mediation, Civil and Criminal Conviction Histories This case was ineligible for mediation as \$87(2)(6) does not visit NYC often, had stated he was planning on filing a lawsuit, and because he alleged physical injuries as well as property damage. has not filed a Notice of Claim with the City of New York as of May 20, 2015 with regard to the incident (60-days before the filing deadline).

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

	CITIMAN UNIT CHIECE CCIED INSTOLLES
• § 87(2)(b)	

- PO Arturo Gomez has been a member of the service for 1 year and there are no substantiated CCRB allegations against him.
- PO Miguel Van Brakle has been a member of the service for 1 year and this is the first CCRB complaint against him,
- Lt. Timothy Edwards has been a member of the service for 16 years and there is 1 substantiated CCRB allegations against him.

Page 2 **CCRB Case # 201502958** In CCRB case 201200605, a stop allegation was substantiated, command discipline recommended, and the NYPD decided no disciplinary action or penalty would be imposed.

Finding and Recommendations

Allegations Not Pleaded

- Vehicle stop: Summonses issued to \$87(2)(b) for a loud exhaust and window tints establish the fact that PO Gomez and PO Van Brakle stopped \$87(2)(b) for vehicular violations. Consequently, it is not an allegation.
- **Vehicle search**: \$87(2)(b) noted in his initial complaint that PO Gomez looked around the vehicle and unlocked the glove compartment to obtain his insurance and registration papers before transporting the vehicle to the stationhouse. As \$87(2)(b) did not allege in his sworn testimony that his vehicle was searched, the allegation is not pleaded.

Explanation of Subject Officer Identification

identified PO Gomez and PO Van Brakle by name (which he read from their shields) as the two officers who stopped his vehicle and entered it to forcefully pull him out and then threw him onto the hood of their vehicle.

Solve alleged that PO Van Brakle was cursing at him the entire time, using the word "fuck" and "fucking" in numerous contexts.

further alleged that PO Van Brakle forced him into the back seat of a police vehicle and that PO Gomez scratched his vehicle while driving it to the 67th Precinct stationhouse. As a result, Allegations A and C are pleaded against PO Van Brakle and Allegations B and D are pleaded against PO Gomez. As Lt. Edwards acknowledged participating in the incident satisfactory.

Recommendations

• Allegation A – Discourtesy: PO Miguel Van Brakle spoke rudely to \$87(2)(6)

alleged that throughout the incident, PO Van Brakle used the words "fuck" and "fucking" in numerous contexts towards him, such as "who the fuck do you think you are," "requesting a fucking supervisor," and "get the fuck in the car." PO Van Brakle denied making the alleged discourteous statements to PO Gomez and Lt. Edwards did not hear PO Van Brakle speak rudely to \$87(2)(b). \$87(2)(c)

• Allegation B – Force: PO Arturo Gomez used physical force against §87(2)(b)

• Allegation C – Force: PO Miguel Van Brakle used physical force against § 87(2)(b)

After being asked for his identification and refusing to provide it, \$87(2)(b) explained he was informed by PO Gomez and PO Van Brakle that if he did not provide his identification, they would remove him from his vehicle. PO Van Brakle opened \$87(2)(b) so door and grabbed him by his left arm to pull him out. Once outside of his vehicle, \$87(2)(b) was pushed against his own vehicle and then brought over to the front of the police vehicle, where he was "thrown" chest-down onto the hood with his feet off the ground. \$87(2)(b) alleged he sustained scratches to his shins. While leaned over the hood, \$87(2)(b) was handcuffed.

PO Van Brakle and PO Gomez asked \$87(2)(b) numerous times to provide his identification and each time, \$87(2)(b) stated he would not provide it because he was stopped for no reason. PO Gomez explained to \$87(2)(b) he had been stopped for his loud exhaust, and \$87(2)(b) still refused to provide his identification. PO Van Brakle and PO Gomez each informed \$87(2)(b) that if he did not provide his identification, he would be removed from his

Page 3 CCRB Case # 201502958

vehicle and brought back to the stationhouse to be identified. PO Van Brakle and PO Gomez
unlocked and opened §87(2)(b) s doors as §87(2)(b) refused to step out of his vehicle. PO
Van Brakle and PO Gomez lifted \$87(2)(b) from under his arms to remove him from his
vehicle. PO Van Brakle instructed \$87(2)(b) to turn around so he could be handcuffed but
did not cooperate. PO Van Brakle had to physically turn \$87(2)(b) around but
moved his arms and resisted by leaning into the officers. PO Van Brakle stated he and
PO Gomez pushed their weight back towards \$87(2)(b) and placed him stomach-down onto
the trunk of the Mustang to handcuff him. PO Gomez did not recall leaning \$87(2)(b) on any
vehicle, and stated he was standing when handcuffed at the back of the Mustang. PO Van Brakle
and PO Gomez denied "throwing" \$87(2)(b) onto the hood of any vehicle and did not observe
any scratches on §87(2)(b)
Lt. Edwards was across the street on an unrelated matter when he heard \$87(2)(b)
yelling and a crowd gathered around him and the officers. Lt. Edwards arrived at the scene after
was handcuffed and did not observe any physical force used or any injuries on
Lt. Edwards recalled \$87(2)(b) was not compliant in providing his identification,
even when Lt. Edwards himself asked \$87(2)(0) and explained he would be released with a
summons.
Patrol Guide Procedure §203-11 authorizes officers to use "only the amount of force
necessary to overcome resistance" (Board Review 06).
§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)
Allegation D – Abuse of Authority: PO Arturo Gomez damaged \$87(2)(b) s
• Allegation D – Abuse of Authority: PO Arturo Gomez damaged S 87(2)(b) s property.
property. 887(2)(b) alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to
property. 887(2)(b) alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. 887(2)(b) observed the scratch on his
property. Serica alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. Serica observed the scratch on his vehicle the following morning after the incident. PO Gomez denied having scratched
alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. S37(2)(b) observed the scratch on his vehicle the following morning after the incident. PO Gomez denied having scratched so vehicle while transporting it back to the 67th Precinct stationhouse, and stated he parked
property. Serica alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. Serica observed the scratch on his vehicle the following morning after the incident. PO Gomez denied having scratched
alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. S37(2)(b) observed the scratch on his vehicle the following morning after the incident. PO Gomez denied having scratched so vehicle while transporting it back to the 67th Precinct stationhouse, and stated he parked
alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. \$87(2)(b) observed the scratch on his vehicle the following morning after the incident. PO Gomez denied having scratched so vehicle while transporting it back to the 67 th Precinct stationhouse, and stated he parked it outside the stationhouse. PO Van Brakle and Lt. Edwards did not observe a scratch on the
alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. \$87(2)(b) observed the scratch on his vehicle the following morning after the incident. PO Gomez denied having scratched so vehicle while transporting it back to the 67 th Precinct stationhouse, and stated he parked it outside the stationhouse. PO Van Brakle and Lt. Edwards did not observe a scratch on the
alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. \$87(2)(b) observed the scratch on his vehicle the following morning after the incident. PO Gomez denied having scratched so vehicle while transporting it back to the 67 th Precinct stationhouse, and stated he parked it outside the stationhouse. PO Van Brakle and Lt. Edwards did not observe a scratch on the
alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. \$87(2)(b) observed the scratch on his vehicle the following morning after the incident. PO Gomez denied having scratched so vehicle while transporting it back to the 67 th Precinct stationhouse, and stated he parked it outside the stationhouse. PO Van Brakle and Lt. Edwards did not observe a scratch on the
alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. S87(2)(b) observed the scratch on his vehicle the following morning after the incident. PO Gomez denied having scratched vehicle while transporting it back to the 67 th Precinct stationhouse, and stated he parked it outside the stationhouse. PO Van Brakle and Lt. Edwards did not observe a scratch on the vehicle before it left the scene or upon arrive at the stationhouse.
alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. S87(2)(b) observed the scratch on his vehicle the following morning after the incident. PO Gomez denied having scratched vehicle while transporting it back to the 67th Precinct stationhouse, and stated he parked it outside the stationhouse. PO Van Brakle and Lt. Edwards did not observe a scratch on the vehicle before it left the scene or upon arrive at the stationhouse.
alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. S87(2)(b) observed the scratch on his vehicle the following morning after the incident. PO Gomez denied having scratched vehicle while transporting it back to the 67 th Precinct stationhouse, and stated he parked it outside the stationhouse. PO Van Brakle and Lt. Edwards did not observe a scratch on the vehicle before it left the scene or upon arrive at the stationhouse.
alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. S87(2)(b) observed the scratch on his vehicle the following morning after the incident. PO Gomez denied having scratched vehicle while transporting it back to the 67 th Precinct stationhouse, and stated he parked it outside the stationhouse. PO Van Brakle and Lt. Edwards did not observe a scratch on the vehicle before it left the scene or upon arrive at the stationhouse.
alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. S87(2)(b) observed the scratch on his vehicle the following morning after the incident. PO Gomez denied having scratched vehicle while transporting it back to the 67 th Precinct stationhouse, and stated he parked it outside the stationhouse. PO Van Brakle and Lt. Edwards did not observe a scratch on the vehicle before it left the scene or upon arrive at the stationhouse.
alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. S87(2)(b) observed the scratch on his vehicle the following morning after the incident. PO Gomez denied having scratched vehicle while transporting it back to the 67 th Precinct stationhouse, and stated he parked it outside the stationhouse. PO Van Brakle and Lt. Edwards did not observe a scratch on the vehicle before it left the scene or upon arrive at the stationhouse.
alleged his 2000 Ford Mustang which he just had repainted, was returned to him from police custody with a large scratch on it. S87(2)(b) observed the scratch on his vehicle the following morning after the incident. PO Gomez denied having scratched vehicle while transporting it back to the 67 th Precinct stationhouse, and stated he parked it outside the stationhouse. PO Van Brakle and Lt. Edwards did not observe a scratch on the vehicle before it left the scene or upon arrive at the stationhouse.

Page 4 CCRB Case # 201502958

Pod:3		
Investigator:Signature	Rebecca Ho Print	06/03/2015 Date
Supervisor: Title/Signature	Print	Date
Reviewer: Title/Signature	Print	Date
Reviewer: Title/Signature	Print	Date